

**Enumerated Paragraphs 4, 5 and 6.** The Official Action at enumerated paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 rejects Claims 1-9, 11-12, 16, 20-22, 26-29, 33-35 and 39-61 over Albrinck in view of Takahashi. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed in the Amendment and Response filed May 14, 2001, there is no suggestion to modify Albrinck, and, in fact, Takahashi actually teaches away from a combination with Takahashi. Albrinck uses an IMPREGANTING resin (see, for example claim 1), while Takahashi teaches coating the SURFACE of a substrate (see column 9, lines 10-28, in particular, col. 9, lines 11-13). Takahashi goes so far as to instruct the skilled artisan in ways to AVOID PENETRATION of a material into which the coating composition would otherwise penetrate (col. 9, lines 17 – 26). On this basis alone, there is no motivation to combine the references and no prima facie case of obviousness is established.

In enumerated paragraph 10, the Examiner takes the position that when coating a porous material as in Takahashi, the coating composition does in fact penetrate the surface of the substrate or at least partially impregnates the substrate. The applicants respectfully disagree with both the position taken and the use made of the position. It is the clear teaching of Takahashi to AVOID PENETRATION (see especially col. 9, lines 10 – 28), even going so far as to teach the formation of a separate layer (method 2) that is then applied to the porous substrate. The Examiner's position is thus not supported by the reference, but is rather a hindsight interpretation of the reference. Further, even assuming arguendo at least partial impregnation, combination of the two references is not appropriate. This is because the issue is not whether there is partial penetration of the substrate of Takahashi. Rather, the issue is whether the penetration-averse disclosure of Takahashi is obvious to combine with the impregnation technology of Albrinck. For the reasons presented above, the applicants respectfully submit that the combination is not obvious.

Since the proposed combination of Albrinck and Takashashi cannot be sustained, withdrawal of rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-12, 16, 20-22, 26-29, 33-35 and 39-61 based on such a combination is respectfully requested.

RECEIVED  
OCT 3 2001  
TC 1700

Enumerated Paragraphs 7, 8 and 9. The Official Action at enumerated paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 rejects Claims 1 – 9, 11 – 12, 16, 20 – 22, 26 – 29, 33 – 35 and 39 – 61 over Albrinck in view of 3M and Zeelan. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

There is no motivation to modify Albrinck to use 3M and Zeelan particles, and assuming arguendo the combination, there is no expectation of success and certainly not the high degree of success achieved with the current invention.

The technological problem addressed in the instant invention is improved scratch resistance of certain synthetic resin film. The applicants see no teaching or suggestion in Albrinck or the 3M and Zeelan reference that would motivate the skilled artisan to use the ceramic microspheres of 3M and Zeelan in Albrinck to improve scratch resistance. Further, assuming arguendo the combination of the references, there is nothing to suggest the high degree of scratch resistance achieved with the current invention (compare, for example, the 200 gram load applied with the edge of a glass microscope slide in Albrinck with the 3 and 3.5 Newton force applied with diamond point tested on the instant invention). Withdrawal of the rejection based on the combination of Albrinck and the 3M and Zeelan reference is respectfully requested.

In view of the comments above, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

The undersigned invites the Examiner to telephone him at (914) 674-5460 if there are any issues outstanding in this application, and especially if there is any specific information that applicants could present to place this application in condition for allowance.

Akzo Nobel Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department  
7 Livingstone Avenue  
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522-3408  
Tel No.: (914) 674-5460

Respectfully submitted,

David H. Vickrey  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 30,697

RECEIVED  
DEC 17 2007  
1700